

**IN THE  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**Inventors:** Simon Dodd et al.      **Examiner:** Pert, Evan  
**Serial No:** 10/697,394      **Group Art Unit:** 2828  
**Filing Date:** October 30, 2003      **Confirmation No.:** 7466  
**Title:** Optical Targets

**Mail Stop:** AF  
**COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS**  
**P.O. Box 1450**  
**Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

**Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance**

Dear Sir:

In Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance, Examiner states particular limitations found variously in the claims as the reasons for allowance. Applicants respectfully traverse this potentially limiting statement. It is the combination of elements specifically as recited in each of the claims that determine the allowability over art. Selecting any one or two elements while ignoring the remainder could unfairly and improperly limit the scope of the invention claimed. Examiner's statement of the limitations may not be an exact recitation of the allowed language of the claim and therefore could improperly be used to characterize the claimed invention in a way not intended and explicitly written by Applicants and allowed by the PTO.

Therefore, while Applicants agree with Examiner's conclusions regarding patentability without necessarily agreeing with or acquiescing in the Examiner's reasoning. In particular, Applicants submit that the claims are allowable because the prior art fails to teach, anticipate, or render obvious the invention as claimed independent of how the invention is paraphrased.

Hewlett-Packard Company  
1000 NE Circle Blvd. m/s 422B  
Corvallis, OR 97330  
(541) 715-1694

Respectfully submitted,  
Simon Dodd et al.

By: /Donald J. Coulman/  
Donald J. Coulman  
Reg. No. 50,406  
Attorney for Applicant  
Date: 9 May 2007